

Serial No. 10/511,022
Atty. Doc. No. 2002P06124WOUS

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 22 2006

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REMARKS

Claims 4, 9, 10, and 12 are pending in the application. Claim 4 is objected to because of an informality. Claims 4, 9, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art [hereinafter AAPA] in view of Becker (US 6,233,509), Nishikawa et al. (US 6,587,901), and Price et al. (US 5,920,197). Claims 1, 9, 10, and 12 are amended herein. Claims 4, 9, 10, and 12 are presented for examination.

Response to claim objections

The informality in claim 4 has been corrected herein as required.

Response to rejections under 35 USC 103(a)

Examiner states at the end of page 4: "Therefore, it would have been obvious . . . for the advantage of providing the separation of two components, i.e., line driver and field bus controller, such that one of the components, i.e. line driver, is in the connector at one end of the cable and the other component, i.e. field bus controller, is in said mobile data unit (i.e., analyzer) at the other end of a data link (i.e., cable, See Becker, col. 2, lines 29-38)." Here the Examiner uses the term "field bus controller" to mean a mobile controller corresponding to Applicant's claimed "mobile data unit", or the "BuB" device of Applicant's FIGs 3 and 4. However, the term "controller" in Applicant's claims 4 and 12 refers instead to a local industrial controller or PLC as shown in FIG 4 and as described in Applicant's paragraph [0019]. The distinction between these claim elements should be clear from the claims and description, because Applicant's local controller or PLC is what transmits a selection of views to the mobile data unit via an additional signal line, per paragraph [0022]. Applicant's mobile data unit would not transmit a selection of views to itself. The present claim amendments further clarify this distinction.

Serial No. 10/511,022
Atty. Doc. No. 2002P06124WOUS

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Applicant understands the Examiner's points in paragraph 7 of the Office Communication titled "Response to Arguments." However, the invention of Price is a sensing circuit (title, abstract, claims) that eliminates a need for special connector components in order to detect the presence of a signal (col. 2 lines 59-63). Combining the sensor circuit of Price with the system of Nishikawa would replace the connection detection circuit 210 of Nishikawa. However, Nishikawa does not describe any special connector components in the bus connectors 109, 209 or in the bus control connectors 114, 214 for presence detection, so there is no motivation in the prior art for this combination.

Regardless of whether this combination is motivated, a selection of views is transmitted by a presence detection circuit in neither Nishikawa nor Price. In Nishikawa (FIG 1), bus control signals are transmitted by bus control circuit BC, 213, and data signals are transmitted by a data bus 206. The presence detection circuit 210 is separately connected to the CPU 201 of the host processing apparatus 200 – not to connectors 209, 214. Thus it transmits no control or data signals to the portable information terminal 100. In Price (FIG 3), an information transmission 50 transmits a selection of views (col. 5, lines 41-46). This line 50 is separate from the detection circuit 60, and only communicates to it at 52 when no peripheral device is present (col. 5, lines 46-53). The sensing circuit 60 produces a change between two logic levels to indicate the presence or absence of a peripheral connector. To achieve this passively, the sensing circuit 60 converts the outgoing information signal on line 50 into a DC bipolar signal. Thus acting as a low-pass filter, the sensing circuit 60 eliminates any views that could pass through it from data line 50.

Neither the system of Nishikawa nor the presence detection circuit Price comprise a digital signal line that transmits a selection of views from a local controller to a mobile data unit via the digital signal line, as claimed in both of Applicant's independent claims 4 and 12. Furthermore, Price teaches away from such capability by teaching a sensing circuit that intentionally filters out any signals capable of transmitting views.

Therefore, neither Nishikawa nor Price, in any combination with each other or with the other cited art, can produce a view-transmitting detection circuit as claimed in the present independent claims 4 and 12 and more specifically in dependent claim 9. Accordingly the

Serial No. 10/511,022
Atty. Doc. No. 2002P06124WOUS

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

cited prior art cannot produce Applicant's invention as claimed, and does not support the 35 USC 103 rejections.

Conclusion

For a claim to be obvious under 35 USC 103, any modification to known prior art must also be suggested by the prior art, not by the Applicant's invention; furthermore, such modification must work, and it must produce the Applicant's claimed invention. These criteria are not met by the cited prior art, as argued above. Therefore the Applicant believes this application to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Dated: Aug 22, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Daniel J. Staudt
Registration No. 34,733
(407) 736-2415

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830